DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 956 JC 860 001

AUTHOR Moore, Kathryn M.; Twombly, Susan B.

TITLE Administrator Mobility: Crossing the Boundary between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities.

INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.

SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jan 85
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrators; Administrator Selection; Career Development; *College Faculty; Colleges; Community Colleges; *Employment Patterns; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Occupational Mobility; Postsecondary Education; Professional Development; Two Year Colleges; Universities

ABSTRACT

In 1981, a national survey entitled Leaders in Transition was conducted to determine biographical and employment information about upper-level administrators at four-year colleges, as well as information about job characteristics and issues facing administrators and their institutions. The sample consisted of approximately 4,000 administrators from a total population of 20,000 administrators in 1,600 institutions. Study findings were used to investigate the question of institutional crossover, i.e., the specific situation in which current four-year college and university administrators were previously employed at a two-year college. Of the 2,896 respondents to the survey, 170 (5.8%) had at one time held at least one position at a two-year institution. Responses from this group indicated: (1) the largest percentage of two-year college crossovers (52.9%) were currently employed in liberal arts colleges, compared to 39.8% of the general sample; (2) barely 10% of the institutional crossovers were employed in doctoral-granting institutions; (3) the administrative positions most frequently held by two-year college personnel were student affairs officer (8.8%), registrar (7%), dean of continuing education (6%), chief academic officer (5%), and head librarian (5%); (4) like the general sample, the crossover group was comprised mostly of males, between 35 and 50 years of age, who held associate or full professor ranks; (5) the crossover group was better educated than their administrative peers; and (6) in comparison to crossover men, crossover women were more likely to hold two--as opposed to three--degrees, were employed in a smaller number of positions, were more likely to have a mentor, and were younger. A literature review on faculty and administrator mobility is included. (EJV)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Toombs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED263956

ADMINISTRATOR MOBILITY: CROSSING THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN TWO-YEAR AND FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Kathryn M. Moore
and
Susan B. Twombly

IC 860 001

The Pennsylvania State University
325 Pond Lab
University Park, PA 16802

ADMINISTRATOR MOBILITY: CROSSING THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN TWO-YEAR AND FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Kathryn M. Moore
and
Susan B. Twombly

Center for the Study of Higher Education
325 Pond Laboratory
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

January, 1985

A study completed for the Ford Foundation, the Exxon Education Foundation, and the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association.

Not to be reproduced in whole or in part without the express written consent of the authors.

The mobility of college and university and administrators is a much discussed topic these days, largely because it is believed that little is going on. A variety of societal and economic factors are thought to drastically limit the ability of administrators to move from job to job, from one college or university to another or to a different geographic location. Career consciousness among the individuals and personnel needs of increasingly sophisticated institutions have helped to create this interest and to sustain a new body of scholarship focused on administrators.

Until quite recently there was little research which attempted to describe or explain how administrators move among different jobs or institutions. Little is known about what characteristics are related to this movement. That is, are administrators more likely to find career advancement within their home institutions or is movement to other colleges and universities required? And, if institutional movement is advisable, is there direction to the movement? Are administrators more likely to move from doctoral universities to two-year colleges and vice versa? In other words, how does the labor market for administrators work?

Answers to these questions about inter-institutional movement have implications for the individuals in the midst of planning or carrying out their careers as administrators. But, perhaps more importantly, information about administrator movement among institution types can provide valuable insights into how colleges and universities function as organizations to manage human resources and to provide for the succession of leadership. As higher education institutions face a variety of current crises including declining student populations and shrinking resources, the need for competent and innovative administrators increases. More than ever, colleges and universities need to understand how they provide for leadership so that its development can be maximized.

Yet we are guided by studies from another era in the history of higher education. Most of the research which deals with inter-institutional movement concentrates on faculty mobility in a period of expansion. However, the ideas from these studies are important as a starting place because they have shaped perceptions of how the academic labor market functions.

Faculty Mobility Studies

Academic mobility for faculty has been conceptualized as a social (Caplow and McGee, 1958; McGee, 1971) and economic process (Brown, 1967). As a social process, academic mobility consists of a series of more or less standard social interactions between the searching institution and the potential recruit (McGee, 1971). Both institutional and departmental prestige influence the mobility of faculty. Caplow and McGee (1958) invented the now famous description of the higher education prestige system known as the Major League, Minor League, Bush League, and Academic Siberia. They argue that most faculty are trained in the Major League (research universities), but are hired by the Minor League (comprehensive colleges and universities) and the Bush League (liberal arts colleges). Academic Siberia -- the two-year colleges -- operates on the fringes of their prestige system but is not ever considered as a

legitimate part of the overall system of higher education. They observed that the increased need for faculty in the Major League universities would result in a need for these same universities to hire more of their own, thereby creating a shortage in the lower prestige institutions. Nevertheless, faculty almost always move down, according to Caplow and McGee, and should not expect to be employed by institutions of higher prestige.

However, McGee (1971) later found that, contrary to the belief he himself helped to perpetrate, the labor market for the private universities of the Major League was universal in scope. Faculty at such institutions received probes from the Minor League colleges and universities as well as from the colleges of the Bush League. Moreover, personal familiarity with persons at the probing institution was found to be an important factor in linking faculty from different type institutions. McGee concluded that personal, departmental, and institutional prestige colored market decisions and limited choices.

Brown's (1967) analysis of faculty movement from an economic perspective also centers on institutional prestige. While faculty mobility is generally believed to occur in a downward direction from high prestige to low prestige institutions, he prefers to describe movement among institution types as a spectrum of circles with broadly overlapping membership. Inter-institutional movement, or its lack, may result from the fact that different types of colleges and universities have different purposes and missions and require different skills. Brown's study (1967) revealed that not one of the five institutional prestige groups he observed drew a majority of its faculty from within its own group. Movement outside of the top 20 percent of major doctoral institutions is necessarily downward because more Ph.D.'s are produced than can be employed. However, direction of movement was described by Brown as depending upon the faculty members' original institutional position such that some movement was upward as well. Activities such as publishing appeared to help to prevent downward movement.

Brown also makes the important point that failure to move upward may be the result of personal preference rather than barriers to movement initiated by the upper group. Brown writes: "Since neither professors nor institutions change ability and emphasis very rapidly, we would expect that, except for occasional false moves, a professor who once chose a small college as the type of institution that best matches his ability would tend to remain in a small college" (Brown, p. 103). Therefore, Brown concluded that job switching tended to go on between colleges of similar type. Size was also found to be a key limiting characteristics in that faculty clearly preferred institutions of the same size as their current ones.

As recently as 1980, Smelser and Content confirmed that relatively few institutions at the top of the prestige hierarchy recruit faculty from outside of their own circles. In a study of job recruitment for sociology faculty in which affirmative action was also a concern, Smelser and Content found that the department's own informal preferences concerning the institutional origins of the recruits prevailed despite efforts to consider individuals from other, lesser prestige institutions.

Administrator Mobility Studies

Only a few recent studies have focused on administrator mobility in higher education (e.g., Socolow, 1973; Sagaria and Moore, 1983), and most consider inter-institutional mobility only tangentially.

The best study of inter-institutional mobility of administrators focused specifically on presidential mobility (Birnbaum, 1971). Birnbaum argues that colleges and universities attempt to minimize conflict over presidential succession first by preferring outside candidates, and second by selecting persons who have been socialized in institutions with similar characteristics. He found that institutions were likely to select presidents from colleges and universities that had similar student selection policies, similar missions and that were under the same type of control. Institution size did not appear to be important.

However, Birnbaum did find some mobility of presidents among types of institutions. This movement was determined to be directional rather than random. Birnbaum used the concept of exchange value to explain how this inter-institutional movement occurred. Exchange value equals prestige of the institution multiplied by the status of the position. Thus, an individual's status can be maintained when institutional prestige is decreased by moving to a position of higher status at that institution. For example, a dean at a research university may preserve his or her status by taking a presidency but not a deanship at a comprehensive college. That is, a person will seek not to lose status when changing jobs.

Birnbaum argued that the prestige of universities creates an exchange value so high that no two-year college position would have status high enough to match any move. Consequently, there is little chance that universities will hire two-year college persons as presidents. Individuals from the four-year colleges can become university presidents only if they occupied high status positions at their previous institutions. His argument further specifies that individuals can move to a university presidency from both high and low status positions within the same or similar prestige university. To become a two-year college president, however, aspirants from other low prestige institutions must occupy high status positions. Being in the middle of the prestige continuum, four-year liberal arts colleges appear to draw from both high and low status positions at both high and low prestige institutions. Thus, Birnbaum concludes that prestige rankings may be critical in the selection process. It should be noted that Birnbaum does not question the basic hierarchy of prestige for institutions that was set out by Caplow and McGee, although he observed some refinements on the basic scheme.

Birnbaum's study was conducted over ten years ago. Recently there appears to be renewed interest arising primarily out of the increasing professionalization and career consciousness of administrators themselves. A second source is the perceived need among institutions for better prepared academic leaders. The institutions may not be able to supply all of their needs from internal promotions of faculty or other staff and must look more often to other institutions for personnel. A final impetus for examining administrator mobility are the affirmative action policies which mandate wider search practices out of reasons of

equity. This latter concern has generated an awareness that certain desirable characteristics may not be evenly distributed among the administrative work force. For example, various studies (VanAlstyne, et al., 1977) have shown that women and minorities are clustered in certain types of institutions, yet all institutions presumably have an interest in improving their numbers in these categories. Understanding how mobility takes place among administrators is basic to altering any such distribution.

Methodology

In 1981, a national survey entitled Leaders in Transition was developed and administered by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University. A standardized questionnaire of 29 items was developed and pilot tested. The instrument incorporated biographical and employment items as well as items about job characteristics and opinions concerning issues facing administrators and their institutions in the future. Of particular importance to the question addressed here was the item requesting a complete job history, including all paid employment, all employers, and dates of employment.

Data Source

The target population for the survey consisted of upper-level line administrators in all accredited, four-year, degree-granting institutions in the coterminous United States. Administrators who fit that criteria are identified by name in the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) computer file for the Fall of 1979. The sample consisted of approximately 20 percent, or 4,000 administrators from a total population of 20,000 administrators in 1,600 institutions. In addition, the sample was stratified by position type among the administrative positions listed in the 1979-80 Educational Directory. Therefore, the sample includes such generic titles as presidents, provosts, vice presidents, registrars and deans, but does not include assistant or associate titles with the exception of assistant to the president. An extra twenty percent sample of academic deans was drawn.

A three-stage mail-out and follow-up procedure was initiated in March 1981 and culminated in June 1981. A response rate of 73 percent was achieved.

It should be noted that although individuals employed in two-year institutions were not included in the Leaders sample, the reported work histories of some of the respondents included prior positions in two-year colleges. It is this subsample of the larger group that is of interest in this paper.

Institutional Crossover: A Definition

Institutional crossover is defined as occurring when an administrator has held a position at a type of postsecondary education institution which is different from the type at which he or she is currently employed. For the purposes of this analysis we are concerned with the specific situation in which current four-year college and university administrators were previously employed for at least one position at a two-year college. This group of administrators will be referred to as two-year college crossovers.

Institution type is determined by using a taxonomy developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). The major categories of institution types included in this taxonomy are:

(A) major doctoral-granting universities,[1]
(B) comprehensive colleges and universities,[2]
(C) liberal arts colleges,[3]
(D) specialized schools, and
(E) two-year colleges.[4]

---

[1] According to NCHEMS definition, major doctoral-granting institutions are those which are "characterizied by a significant level of activity in and commitment to doctoral-level education as measured by the number of doctorate recipients and diversity in doctorate program offerings" (Makowski and Wulfsberg, 1980, p. 6).

[2] Comprehensive institutions "are characterized by a strong, diverse post-baccalaureate program (including first professional degrees), but do not engage in significant doctoral-level education." Specifically, this category includes "institutions not considered specialized schools in which the number of doctoral-level degrees granted is less than 30 or in which fewer than three doctoral-level programs are offered. In addition, these institutions must grant a minimum of 30 post-baccalaureate degrees and either grant degrees in three or more post-baccalaureate programs or alternatively, have an interdisciplinary program at the post-baccalaureate level" (Makowski and Wulfsberg, 1980, p. 6-7).

[3] General baccalaureate colleges are institutions "characterized by their primary emphasis on general baccalaureate education. They are not significantly engaged in post-baccalaureate education. Included are institutions not considered specialized institutions in which the number of post-baccalaureate degrees granted is less than 30 or in which fewer than three post-baccalaureate level programs are offered, but which either: (a) grant baccalaureate degrees and grant degrees in three or more baccalaureate programs, or (b) offer a baccalaureate program in interdisciplinary studies. Additionally, over 75 percent of these degrees granted must be at the baccalaureate level or above" (Makowski and Wulfsberg, 1980, p. 7).

[4] E1 -- Comprehensive Two-Year Institutions are institutions in which the number of degrees awarded in occupational and vocational areas is greater than 20 percent but less than 80 percent of all degrees awarded.

E2 -- Academic Two-Year Institutions are institutions in which the number of degrees awarded in the academic area (5600 field in the HEGIS taxonomy) is at least 80 percent of all degrees awarded.

E3 -- Multi-program Occupational Two-Year Institutions are institutions which confer degrees or awards in two or more occupational programs and which grant less than 20 percent of their degrees in the academic area (5600 field in the HEGIS taxonomy) (Makowski and Wulfsberg, 1980).

An additional "other" category was created because the original coding scheme for the survey used the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education and the two classification schemes do not correspond perfectly. For instance, four institutions classified as four-year colleges in the Carnegie taxonomy are categorized as two-year colleges by the NCHEMS one. These four institutions, along with six which are classified as specialized schools in the NCHEMS system, are coded as "other" for the purposes of this analysis.

Finally, it must be noted that it is not necessary under the NCHEMS taxonomy to impute a prestige ranking to these groupings. Some readers may be tempted to do so, especially because it is sometimes argued that two-year colleges are a separate kind of post-secondary institution altogether. Our own position is to suppose that post-secondary institutions are more similar to each other in labor market terms than they are to other types of industries or educational institutions. Therefore, they are more likely to draw their administrators from among this post-secondary market. The question here is not testing this latter assumption, but rather we seek to describe the characteristics of administrators hired by four-year institutions from among two-year college administrative personnel.

Two-Year Crossover Sample

There was a total of 2,896 respondents in the Leaders survey spread among 55 administrative positions. Of the 2,896 respondents, 170 or 5.8 percent have at one time in their careers held at least one position at a two-year college.

At first glance it appears that a very small percentage of the total sample have worked at two-year colleges. However, this figure is misleading in that a substantial portion of the total group of administrators have not ever changed institution type although they may have changed jobs and even institutions during their careers. Consequently, it is more accurate to determine the percentage of two-year college crossovers based on the number of administrators who made inter-institutional job changes. In order to do this it is necessary to determine the percentage of administrators in the sample currently employed at each type of institution in the NCHEMS taxonomy who were ever employed at a different type of institution.

Therefore, of the total 2,896 administrators, 1,152 or 39.8 percent had crossed-over to an institution different from the one in which they are currently employed for at least one position in their careers. This increases the percentage of two-year college crossovers out of this group to 14.8 percent.

The focus of the following analysis is on the professional, educational, and personal backgrounds of these 170 administrators now working in four-year colleges and universities who had worked at two-year colleges at some earlier point in their careers. The characteristics of these administrators will be compared to those of the total sample of

2,896 administrators in order to answer the question: What characteristics, if any, differentiate administrators with two-year college experience from those who do not have it?

Results

Professional Background. The 170 two-year crossover administrators are currently employed in 34 different positions. The 12 positions in which the greatest numbers are found is provided in Table 1 below.

The distribution of crossover administrators as compared to the larger sample reveals some interesting findings. For instance, the largest percentage of two-year crossovers are currently employed in liberal arts colleges (52.9 percent) compared to 39.8 percent of the general sample. While liberal arts colleges generally represent the largest aggregate percentage for both groups, the crossover proportion is much the larger. However, two-year crossovers are not not well represented in the doctoral universities with only 10 percent working there compared to more than twice that percentage (22.7 percent) in the general sample. The percentage representation of crossovers compared to the general sample is similar for the Comprehensive colleges and universities; with 31.8 percent for the crossovers and 34.3 percent for the general sample. There are no crossover administrators working in the "other" category of institutions, but 3 percent of the general sample are located there.

The number of jobs held by the two-year crossover administrators ranged from 2 to 13. The modal number of positions was six. The general sample does not differ to any great extent from these figures, and six is the modal number for them as well.

With respect to faculty rank, the general sample and the crossovers are similar. Slightly more of the general sample of 2,896 respondents hold rank; that is 50.9 percent, compared to 41.3 percent of the crossovers. Of those holding rank, 62.5 percent are full professors compared to 42.0 percent of the crossovers; 18.7 percent are associate professors compared to 29.0 percent of the crossovers; and 12.8 percent of the general sample are assistant professors and 4.3 percent are instructors compared to 20.3 percent and 5.8 percent respectively for the crossovers.

When asked to indicate when they first began their current position, over two-thirds of the two-year crossovers indicated they began in 1976 or later. Consequently, the majority had been in their current positions for five years or less. Substantially smaller percentages of the total sample (42.0 percent) began their current positions since 1976. However, only 18.8 percent of the two-year crossovers were the

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF TWO-YEAR CROSSOVERS IN THE TWELVE MOST FREQUENTLY HELD ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS
N = 139

Position	Number	Percent
Chief Student Affairs Officer	15	8.8
Registrar	14	7.0
Chief Academic Officer	10	5.0
Head Librarian	10	5.0
Chief Business Officer	9	4.0
Director of Financial Aid	9	4.0
Director of Admissions	8	4.0
Dean of Continuing Education	8	6.0
Chief Development Officer	7	3.5
Director of Computer Center	7	3.5
Chief Executive Officer	7	3.5
Dean of Graduate School	7	3.5
Director of Student Placement	7	3.5
All Other Academic Dean Positions	21	21.3

first to hold their current positions, while 18 percent of the general sample reported being the first occupant. On the other hand, over one-half (59.0 percent) of the crossover administrators were the first to hold at least one of their professional positions, compared to 47.9 percent of the total sample.

One final question in the background section of the survey dealt with whether or not the respondents had a mentor or mentors during their careers. A mentor relationship is a relationship with a more experienced individual who may have guided, advised, and assisted the respondent in the early stages of their careers. On this issue there is great similarity between the crossover administrators and the total sample. At least one such relationship was reported by 53.3 percent of the crossover group and 53.2 percent of the total sample.

A few summary statements can be made concerning the professional backgrounds of two-year crossovers compared to the total sample of administrators. While the crossovers are employed in a wide variety of positions, those holding the positions of head librarian, chief academic administrator, registrar, and chief student affairs administrator each compose five percent or more of the crossovers. In addition, academic deanships of many types have a large number of crossover administrators. As we might expect from the literature on academic mobility cited above, larger proportions of the two-year crossovers are employed at liberal arts colleges than is the total sample. In contrast a smaller proportion of crossovers are now employed in major doctoral universities than is the case in the total sample. In general, then, it appears that certain positions and institution types are more open to administrators from two-year colleges.

With respect to the faculty credential of academic rank, the crossovers appear in larger proportions in the lower categories of rank, and in general tend to hold rank less frequently than the overall sample. In addition, a greater proportion of the two-year crossovers began their current positions more recently than the general sample. Crossovers are also substantially more likely to have been the first occupant of one of their positions, although not usually their current one in a four-year college.

Educational Background. Educational background is an important component of administrative careers. Consequently, administrators were asked to list their earned degrees, subject areas, and institutions. The majority of the crossovers report three earned degrees (51.5 percent) compared to 46.1 percent of the total sample. Nearly all of the crossovers hold masters degrees (90.6 percent) and 52.9 percent hold doctorates. Of those who hold doctorates, 50 percent have earned a Ph.D. and 46.7 percent hold Ed.D.'s. The most common fields of specialty at the masters level are education (44.6 percent), the humanities (22.3 percent), and other professional fields (12.7 percent). At the doctoral level, 69.5 percent of the two-year crossovers specialized in education, particularly higher education administration (37.9 percent). The majority (61.3 percent) of crossovers who hold doctorates earned their degrees at institutions classified as A-1 by the NCHEMS

taxonomy. The A-1 (major doctoral granting) universities are the leading 75 institutions with regard to research expenditures. Another 29.3 percent earned their doctorates from A-2 universities which includes all other major doctoral institutions. This compares with 64.0 percent of the larger sample who earned doctorates from A-1 universities, and 30.5 percent who earned doctorates from A-2 universities.

Among the total sample, smaller percentages of administrators reported holding three degrees (41.6 percent). Approximately 80 percent earned masters degrees and 50.2 percent earned doctorates. Education was the predominant field of study at both the masters and doctoral level for this group as it was for the crossovers.

In general, the two-year crossover administrators appear to have more degrees and to have earned them at major doctoral universities somewhat more often than the administrators in the total sample. Higher percentages of the crossovers hold three degrees. Notable also is the high percentage of doctorates in the field of education, particularly higher education, represented in both groups.

Personal Background. The gender, race, and age distributions of the two groups are generally quite similar. Over three-fourths (78.8 percent) of the two-year crossover administrators are male, which is similar to the 80 percent male representation in the total group. Both the crossovers and the total sample are overwhelmingly white (89.3 percent of the crossovers and 91.8 percent of the total sample). Somewhat larger percentages of the crossover group are Black (6.5 percent compared to 5.6 percent) or belong to other racial or ethnic groups (3.5 percent compared to 2.8 percent).

Two-year crossovers range in age from 26 to 69 with the mean age being 45.4 years. When ages are broken down into ten-year periods, crossovers fall into the following age groups as illustrated in Table 2. Ages of administrators in the total sample range from 24 to 74 years of age. The mean age is 48 years. So, it appears that on average the two-year crossover administrators are younger than the total sample. There also tends to be a larger proportion of crossovers concentrated in younger rather than older age brackets.

Gender and Administrator Careers. As expected there is a relationship between one's gender and a variety of career variables. Among the two-year crossover administrators these differences are not dramatic, but they are nonetheless real. For instance, when examining the data on education attained, crossover women are more likely than the men to hold two degrees; 45.7 percent compared to 29.9 percent. The reverse is true for three degrees; 55.2 percent for men and 37.1 percent for women. This same trend is evident in the total sample where 31.3 percent of the males and 40.5 percent of the females reported earning two degrees; while 49.3 percent of the men and 33.5 percent of the women earned three degrees. In general, a greater proportion of each gender among the crossover administrators holds both two and three degrees compared to their counterparts in the general sample.

TABLE 2

AGES OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

	Two-Year Crossovers N = 170		Total Sample N = 2,896	
Age	N	%	N	%
20-29	5	3.0	74	2.6
30-39	47	28.0	546	19.0
40-49	58	34.5	948	32.9
50-59	45	26.8	925	32.1
60-60	13	7.7	375	13.3
70-75	--	--	10	0.4

Women crossover administrators are currently employed in 19 different positions, with 11.1 percent being chief student affairs officers and 13.9 percent serving as directors of financial aid. The remainder are fairly evenly distributed among the other positions. The men are employed in 32 positions, concentrating in the following six positions: registrar (9.0 percent), chief student affairs officer (8.2 percent), chief academic officer (6.7 percent), head librarian (6.7 percent), chief business officer (6.0 percent), and director of computer center (5.2 percent). While women tend to be more highly concentrated in one or two positions, the men are more evenly spread among more positions.

There are also differences in the type of institution of employment when one controls for gender, as Table 3 illustrates. While both men and women two-year college crossovers are more likely to be currently working in liberal arts colleges, there is a much higher concentration of women crossovers than of men in these colleges. Conversely, men crossovers are much more likely than women to be working currently in major doctoral institutions. However, there is not a statistically significant relationship between gender and type of institution of employment.

With respect to the mentor question, a higher percentage of the women (63.8 percent) report having at least one mentor compared to 50 percent of the men. Again, this reflects a pattern evident in the larger sample; however, it appears to be more exaggerated among the crossover administrators. In the general sample, 55.6 percent of the women and 52.3 percent of the men reported at least one mentor relationship.

A further difference was noted on the question of holding rank. Among the two-year crossovers, 44.7 percent of the men reported holding rank compared to 28.6 percent of the women. This is similar to the findings for the larger sample but the differences are stronger among the crossovers.

Finally, a higher percentage of women (44.4 percent) than men (23.5 percent) are found in the 30-39 age group, while a higher proportion of men are between the ages of 40-49 and 50-59 compared to the women crossovers. In general, the women are younger in both the crossover group and the general sample. This age difference may help explain, or may be correlated with, women holding lower faculty ranks and lacking doctoral degrees.

Recent Crossovers

Among the total group of two-year crossover administrators, there are 59 or 34.7 percent whose position immediately preceding their current four-year college position was in a two-year college. This is a particularly interesting group because we are able to provide additional analysis concerning their reasons for moving to their current positions. These reasons are contained in the answers to a set of survey questions having to do with moving to their current position.

TABLE 3

INSTITUTION TYPE OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT FOR MALE AND FEMALE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE CROSSOVERS

	Institution Type								
	Major Doctoral		Comprehensive		Liberal Arts		Other		
Gender	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL
Male	16	11.9	45	32.8	68	50.7	6	3.7	134
Female	1	2.8	10	27.8	22	91.7	3	8.3	36

The majority of recent crossovers are employed at liberal arts colleges (61.0 percent) or comprehensive colleges and universities (30.5 percent). Less than 10 percent are employed at major doctoral universities or "other" institutions.

The 59 recent crossovers are distributed among 20 administrative positions. The most frequently held current four-year college positions are listed below:

Head Librarian	7
Chief Student Affairs Officer	7
Chief Business Officer	6
Chief Executive Officer	5
Chief Academic Officer	5
Director of Financial Aid	5

These administrators came to their current positions from a total of 36 different administrative positions in two-year colleges. The most frequently held two-year positions were:

Head Librarian	7
Chief Executive Officer	7
Chief Business Officer	4

Assuming a hierarchical order to administrative positions, further analysis of the match between the two moves indicates that recent crossovers are equally likely to have made a lateral move to either a liberal arts college or a comprehensive college or university or to have moved to a different type of position. Approximately one-third (N = 20, 33.9 percent) of the recent crossovers held the same position at the two-year college at which they were most recently employed as the position they currently hold. For instance, two presidents of two-year colleges made the move to presidencies of liberal arts colleges and one to a comprehensive college or university. Six registrars made lateral moves to the registrar's position at either a liberal arts college or comprehensive college or university. Three chief business officers also made this type of move.

It is also possible to identify approximately one-fifth of the recent crossovers (23.7 percent) who made "upward" movement when they moved from the two-year college to the four-year college or university. That is, they moved from an associate/assistant or staff position to a director/dean position in the same functional area. One moved from an assistant to the president at a two-year college to a presidency of liberal arts college and another from a campus director to a presidency. Many of the "upward" moves were within the area of student affairs. Six administrators moved from associate or assistant student affairs positions at two-year colleges to directors of student affairs at liberal arts colleges and comprehensive colleges and universities.

Some (8.5 percent) could also be identified as moving "downward" when moving to a comprehensive or liberal arts college. Two who held presidencies of two-year colleges moved to positions of chief academic officer and one to an assistant to the president position. Two moved

from chief academic officer position at a two-year college to a dean's position at a four-year college or university.

Additional facts of interest about the professional backgrounds of this group show that the majority have moved quite recently to their current positions; 61.6 percent began since 1976 or within five years. Only 8 of the 59 (13.6 percent) are the first to hold their current position, which is a much lower figure than for the crossovers as a group or for the total sample. Yet of this group of recent crossovers, over half were the first to hold at least one of their professional positions, which is a figure higher than for the other two groups.

In addition, slightly more than half (52.5 percent) of the recent crossover administrators report having a mentor. And of these 59 administrators, 28.6 percent hold academic rank; 37 percent are professors; 37 percent are associate professors and 18.8 percent are assistant professors.

Educational Background of Recent Crossovers

Slightly over one-third of the recent crossovers report holding three degrees (33.4 percent); 31 percent hold two degrees, and only 3 report holding 1 degree. However, six report holding four degrees. Of the 18 (47.5 percent) holding doctorates, 60.7 percent have a Ph.D. and 35.7 percent hold the Ed.D. At the master's level, 40.7 percent specialized in education, 22.2 percent in humanities, and 18.5 percent in other professional fields. Education was clearly the field of specialty for 20 out of the 28 who hold doctorates (71.4 percent), with 35.7 percent of these individuals specializing in higher education.

Differences between this group and the larger group of crossovers are also worth noting. Again, the trends are virtually identical, however, individual percentages vary. For instance, a lower percentage of recent crossovers report holding the doctorate; however, of those holding doctorates a higher percentage of the recent crossovers hold the Ph.D.; that is, 60.7 percent compared to 50 percent in the crossover group generally. Also, a greater percentage of the recent crossovers (18.5 percent) specialized in professional fields compared to the whole sample (11.6 percent). A higher percentage of doctorates are in education (71.4 percent) among the recent crossovers compared to the larger group (40.6 percent). Institutional origin of the doctorate also registers differently in that 64 percent of the recent crossovers earned doctorates from A-1 universities compared to 61 percent for crossovers generally.

Personal Background

Men comprise 74.6 percent of the recent crossover group; women, 25.4 percent. Again, the overwhelming majority are white (83.1 percent). However, there are somewhat more individuals from other racial and ethnic groups. Ages ranged from 26 to 64 with the mean being 44.9, and this group is more evenly distributed among the age groups: 29.3 percent falling in the 30-39 age group; 25.9 percent in the 40-49 bracket; and 31.3 percent in the 50-59 age group.

Reasons for Moving to Current Position

As one other aspect of mobility of college and university administrators, respondents were asked to indicate the importance of a range of items on their decisions to move to their current positions. The literature suggests (see Caplow and McGee, 1958; Brown, 1967; Birnbaum, 1971) that a move from a position in a two-year college to a position in a four-year college or university is not as likely to occur as is a move in the other direction, largely because of prestige differences among the institutional types. That is, on a prestige continuum, two-year colleges are considered to be at the low end of the pole. One might expect, then, that increased status and prestige would be of high importance to those moving directly from a two-year college to a four-year institution in their most recent move. Other attributes thought to apply to institutions of higher prestige, such as competence of colleagues, institutional mission and philosophy, should be given high importance by recent crossovers as well.

Table 4 summarizes the responses of the three groups, recent crossovers, crossovers generally, and the total sample, to the survey items regarding reasons for moving to the current position. Regretably, few definite conclusions can be drawn. A higher percentage (59.3 percent) of recent crossovers rated "increased status and prestige" as high or very high in importance compared to crossovers (54.7 percent) generally, and particularly in contrast to the total sample (42.0 percent). Other items in which the recent crossovers exceeded the other two groups in giving high ratings were:

- retirement and benefit plans,
- geographic location,
- ready for a change, and
- institutions physical facilities.

Their new institutions' physical facilities also rated high or very high compared to the other two groups. Some other likely items, however, were of less importance to recent crossovers than to the crossovers generally or for the whole sample; these included competence of colleagues and potential for advancement.

With respect to the item, 'institution mission and philosophy', there is no great difference between the groups. While in general this was one of the two or three most highly rated items for all three groups, the recent crossovers tended to give it less importance relative to some other items such as 'duties and responsibilities' and 'ready for a change.' As a cluster, however, these three items may tell us a bit more about the recent crossovers relative to the other two groups. That is, these three items constitute the most important reasons cited by recent crossover administrators for making the shift from a two-year to a four-year institution. And while each of the items is highly important to the other two groups, they are not rated as being quite so important by them.

TABLE 4

REASONS FOR MOVING TO CURRENT POSITION

Reasons	Regular Sample			Crossovers			Recent Crossovers		
	Low	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	High
		N = 2,896			N = 170			N = 59	
Duties and Responsibilities	2.7	10.9	84.5	2.4	8.2	62.4	1.7	10.2	84.7
Increased Status and Prestige	24.5	28.6	42.0	14.2	30.0	54.7	10.2	30.5	59.3
Retirement and Benefit Plan	54.3	25.6	13.7	48.2	28.8	13.5	49.2	27.1	16.9
Spouse Employment Opportunities	62.7	7.7	11.2	61.2	8.8	5.9	59.3	6.8	8.5
Educational Opportunities for Family	43.9	15.8	21.5	38.8	17.6	21.1	44.1	11.9	20.3
Salary	24.6	38.3	33.9	21.2	35.3	41.2	23.7	35.6	37.3
Competence of Colleagues	18.2	29.9	47.9	27.1	32.4	45.9	15.3	37.3	40.7
Congeniality of Colleagues	15.3	28.9	52.6	18.8	27.1	50.0	16.9	27.1	50.8
Geographic Location	19.5	21.7	56.1	18.9	16.5	61.8	20.3	15.3	62.7
Potential for Advancement	25.6	26.0	44.2	24.7	31.2	38.8	28.8	32.2	28.8
Ready for a Change	14.7	13.2	65.4	10.7	7.6	74.1	6.8	10.2	76.3
Institution Physical Facilities	43.2	32.2	20.4	41.2	32.9	21.2	30.5	42.4	22.0
Institution Mission and Philosophy	13.8	20.6	63.7	15.9	21.2	61.2	11.9	23.7	62.7

NOTE: Figures do not sum to 100 percent because those indicating NA were not reported.

Summary

Is the world of postsecondary education one long continuum in which individuals who begin administrative careers in one type of institution have an equally good chance of ending up in another? What draws administrators from one type of institution, the two-year colleges for example, to another type? Which types of institutions and positions seem the most open to hiring personnel from the two-year colleges? These were some of the questions which resulted in the present study of interinstitutional crossover of administrators currently employed in four-year colleges and universities. The survey scanned a broad range of positions in academic administration across the country.

Taking the literature of faculty mobility as the general point of departure, since research on administrators was not sufficiently focused, a major finding of the research is that administrators generally are not mobile across institution-type boundaries. Fully 60.2 percent do not change institution type for their careers although they may change jobs and institutions within their home type rather frequently -- an average of six moves.

Of the 60 percent who have changed institution type, about 15 percent of them have made at least one job change from a two-year college to a four-year institution. The institutions which have proved to be the most hospitable to two-year college personnel are liberal arts colleges, followed by comprehensive colleges and universities. Barely 10 percent of institutional crossovers end up in the research and doctoral-granting universities.

The administrative positions which have been the most accepting of persons coming from two-year colleges were student affairs, registrar, and dean of continuing education, as well as a variety of academic deanships. The topmost positions on the four-year college organization charts have generally not been open to people from two-year colleges. These positions include president, provost, and dean of the graduate school. However, this is not to say that such moves are impossible. The brief anecdotal information provided above says otherwise. Moreover, it is not necessary to impute a prestige hierarchy to explain that this movement or its lack. Indeed there are counter indications in the sense that those who did move from two-year colleges made lateral or upward job moves while few "traded down" in terms of position in order to move up in terms of imputed institutional prestige. Since most administrators remain within institution type, homogeneity of mission and function may be more compelling as an explanation than any notion of prestige.

What are the individuals like who are able to cross these institutional boundaries? In many ways they are no different than the general sample of administrators. Most are men between the ages of 35 and 50. Many hold the rank of associate or full professor.

But, there are several interesting ways in which the crossover administrators differ from their peers. One of the most striking is that they are rather better educated in that a larger percentage hold

doctorates and from top ranked universities than do their administrative peers generally. The striking finding, however, is that 65 percent of their doctorates are in education, and nearly 40 percent of these are in higher education administration.

There is a pioneering dimension to these individuals that is noted in a variety of factors. First, they show a propensity to move to new positions. Nearly 60 percent had held at least one newly created position in their careers, which is almost three times more than their peers. Over two-thirds have held their current jobs for less than 5 years. Perhaps most telling of all, among the attitudes expressed toward moving, these individuals were more likely to indicate that readiness for a change was a big factor in their decisions to move to their current position.

There were few dramatic differences among the crossover administrators by gender, race, or age. In general, the crossovers were slightly more racially and ethnically diverse, somewhat younger, and with a few more women in their midst.

Gender differences were interesting in several ways, however. First, women crossovers had moved into a much smaller range of positions than had their male crossover counterparts. Student affairs and financial aid were the two principal avenues of entry, while men had many more positions open to them. Women were also more likely to indicate that a mentor was important to them and that their mentors had helped them more recently than did the men.

Of the group of crossovers who had made the change to a four-year college in their last move, the majority had done so within the last 5 years. This group comprised about one-third of the entire crossover group. Over half of this recent crossover group had held at least one newly created position, although it was not their current one in the four-year college. However, they had held nearly twice as many different jobs in the two-year colleges as they went to in the four-year institutions. And, like the general crossover group, the majority had earned education doctorates, a large number in higher education administration.

While the road for administrators between the two-year college and the four-year college is not a particularly well traveled one as career routes go; nevertheless, it is not completely closed. Those individuals with youth and an apparent desire for change may take it and may achieve positions of considerable importance in both the academic as well as non-academic sectors of administration.

For those who see the movement from two-year colleges to four-year institutions as an indication of the natural relatedness among institutional types generally, there is a more important finding. Namely, that administrators generally tend to stay within institution type. What career movement there is, is played out normally within type, not by moving across these boundaries. It is perhaps one of the chief ways institutions who are hiring administrators have of insuring knowledge sufficient to their particular mission and style. It may also be a way

to compensate for the lack of formal credentials in administration per se. This raises the interesting question of what effect the appearance of a growing number of persons with doctorates in higher education administration may mean. At least for the crossovers, it appears to have been a credential which is related to their move to a four-year institution. One cannot know if the acquisition of such a degree was a deliberate act designed to facilitate further career moves up organizational ladders as well as across institutional boundaries. What can be said is that those who did make institution-type shifts have a high proportion of such degrees.

The worlds represented by the various institution types in post-secondary education appear to be sufficiently compelling for most administrators to make their careers within one of them. But a few, a seemingly adventuresome and educationally ambitious few, do make career moves across these boundaries. And institutions for their part, although selective, have been open to such individuals.

REFERENCES

Birnbaum, Robert F. "Presidential succession: an interinstitutional analysis." Educational Record, 52, Spring 1971, pp. 133-145.

Brown, David G. The Mobile Professors. Washington, DC: Amercian Council on Education, 1967.

Caplow, Theodore and McGee, Reece. The Academic Marketplace. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1958.

Makowski, David and Wulfsberg, Rolf. An improved taxonomy of postsecondary institutions. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1980.

McGee, Reece. Academic Janus. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Sagaria, Mary Ann D. and Moore, Kathryn M. "Job change and age: the experience of administrators in colleges and universities." Sociological Spectrum, 3, 1983, pp. 353-370.

Smelser, Neal J. and Content, Robin. The Changing Academic Market. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980.

Socolow, Daniel. "How administrators get their jobs." Change, 54, 1978, pp. 42-43.

VanAlstyne, Carol and Withers, Julie. Women and minorities in administration of higher education institutions: employment patterns and salary comparisons. Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association, June 1977.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
JAN 24 1986